arXiv:1702.01556v1 [math.LO] 6 Feb 2017

Some Brouwerian Counterexamples Regarding Nominal Sets in Constructive Set Theory

Andrew W Swan

February 7, 2017

Abstract

The existence of least finite support is used throughout the subject of nominal sets. In this paper we give some Brouwerian counterexamples showing that constructively, least finite support does not always exist and in fact can be quite badly behaved. On this basis we reinforce the point that when working constructively with nominal sets the use of least finite support should be avoided. Moreover our examples suggest that this problem can't be fixed by requiring nominal sets to have least finite support by definition or by using the notion of subfinite instead of finite.

1 Constructive Set Theory

We work in a constructive set theory such as **CZF**, as described by Aczel and Rathjen in [1]. A detailed knowledge of the axioms of **CZF** is not required for this paper; we only require the following facts. Firstly, the underlying logic of **CZF** is intuitionistic, so we do not assume excluded middle as an axiom, and so can only use instances of excluded middle that can be derived from the other axioms. Secondly, **CZF** includes the axiom schema of bounded separation, so for any set X and any bounded formula (i.e. a formula where each quantifier can be written in the form $\forall y \in z$ or $\exists y \in z$) we can form the set $\{x \in X \mid \phi\}$. Note that ϕ may or may not include x as a free variable. Finally, **CZF** includes the axiom of extensionality, so to show two sets are equal amounts to showing they contain exactly the same elements. The results in this paper also apply to variants of **CZF**, such as **IZF**, which is also defined in [1].

We will use the following terminology conventions for concepts in constructive set theory.

Definition 1.1.

1. We say a set X has *decidable equality* to mean X is a set such that for all $x, y \in X$ we have either $x = y$ or $x \neq y$.
2. If $Y \subseteq X$, we say Y is a *decidable subset* of X to mean that for all $x \in X$, either $x \in Y$ or $x \notin Y$.
3. The natural number n is equal to the set $\{m \mid m < n\}$ and so is itself a set with n elements. In particular 0 is the empty set. We write $\mathbb{N}$ for the set of natural numbers.

4. A set X is *finite* if for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a bijection from n to X.

5. A set X is *finitely enumerable* if for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a surjection from n to X.

6. A set X is *subfinite* if it is a subset of some finitely enumerable set.

7. A set X is *infinite* if for every finite set $Y \subseteq X$ there exists $x \in X$ such that $x \notin Y$.

8. We say a set X is *inhabited* if there exists some set x such that $x \in X$.

We recall the following basic results about finite sets.

Proposition 1.2. *Let X be a set with decidable equality.*

1. *Let Y be a subset of X. Then Y is finite if and only if it is finitely enumerable.*

2. *If a subset Y of X is finite then it is a decidable subset of X.*

3. *Finite subsets of X are closed under binary union and intersection.*

Proof. These statements can be proved by induction on the size of the sets. See [2, Chapter 8] for more details. □

Definition 1.3. The *weak limited principle of omniscience*, **WLPO** is the following axiom. Let $\alpha\colon \mathbb{N} \to 2$ be any binary sequence. The statement $(\forall n \in \mathbb{N})\, \alpha(n) = 0$ is either true or false.

Theorem 1.4. WLPO *is not provable in* **CZF**.

Proof. **WLPO** fails in Kleene realizability models, for example, since it implies the existence of non computable functions. For **CZF** specifically, see the realizability model by Rathjen in [6]. □

If we wish to show that a certain statement is not provable constructively, one way to do this is to use it to derive a principle (in this case **WLPO**) that is already known to be non constructive. This kind of proof is known as Brouwerian counterexample.

2 Nominal Sets

Nominal sets were introduced by Gabbay and Pitts to give an abstract notion of names and binding. Since then they have been applied many places in computer science (see [4]). Recently they have seen applications in the semantics of homotopy type theory (see [5] and [7]).

We recall the following definitions from [4]. Let $\mathbb{A}$ be an infinite set with decidable equality (which we will refer to as the set of *names*). Write $\mathrm{Perm}(\mathbb{A})$ for the group of finite permutations (that is, permutations π such that $\pi(a) = a$ for all but finitely many $a \in \mathbb{A}$). Note that since we are assuming $\mathbb{A}$ has decidable equality, $\mathrm{Perm}(\mathbb{A})$ is precisely the group generated by transpositions (i.e. swapping two elements and fixing everything else). Recall that a $\mathrm{Perm}(\mathbb{A})$-set is a set X, together with an action of $\mathrm{Perm}(\mathbb{A})$ on X, or equivalently a presheaf over $\mathrm{Perm}(\mathbb{A})$ when viewed as a one object category in the usual way.

Definition 2.1 (Pitts, Gabbay)**.**

1. Let X be a Perm($\mathbb{A}$)-set (writing $\cdot$ for the action) and let $x \in X$. We say $A \subseteq \mathbb{A}$ is a *support* for x if whenever $\pi(a) = a$ for all $a \in A$, also $\pi \cdot x = x$.

2. Let X be a Perm($\mathbb{A}$)-set and $x \in X$. We say x is *equivariant* if $\pi \cdot x = x$ for all $\pi \in \mathrm{Perm}(\mathbb{A})$, or equivalently if $\emptyset$ is a support for x.

3. Let X and Y be Perm($\mathbb{A}$)-sets. A function $f : X \to Y$ is *equivariant* if it is a morphism in the category of Perm($\mathbb{A}$) sets, or equivalently if it is equivariant as an element of the exponential Y^X in the category of Perm($\mathbb{A}$) sets, which is described explicitly as the set of functions X to Y with action given by conjugation.

4. A *nominal set* is a Perm($\mathbb{A}$)-set X, such that for every $x \in X$, there exists a finite set $A \subseteq \mathbb{A}$ such that A is a support for x.

Proposition 2.2. *Let X be a* Perm($\mathbb{A}$)*-set and let A and B be finite supports of $x \in X$. Then $A \cap B$ is also a finite support of x. Hence also, whenever $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ are finite supports of $x \in X$ so is $A_1 \cap \ldots \cap A_n$.*

Proof. The proof of [4, Proposition 2.3] is already constructive as stated, but we include a proof here anyway to illustrate the proof techniques used for this kind of result.

To show $A \cap B$ is a support for x, we only have to show that for each finite permutation π that fixes each element of $A \cap B$, we have $\pi \cdot x = x$.

First note that by [4, Theorem 1.15] we can find $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ and $a'_1, \ldots, a'_n$ such that $\pi(a_i) \neq a_i \neq a'_i \neq \pi(a'_i)$ and π decomposes as a product of transpositions

$$\pi = (a_1\ a'_1) \circ \ldots \circ (a_n\ a'_n) \tag{1}$$

(The argument in [4] is an explicit argument by induction which is constructive as stated, using the decidability of equality for $\mathbb{A}$ and in particular decidability of finite subsets.)

Since π fixes each element of $A \cap B$ and $\pi(a_i) \neq a_i$ we have $a_i \notin A \cap B$ and similarly $a'_i \notin A \cap B$. Now note if each transposition $(a_i\ a'_i)$ fixes x, then so does π. Hence the problem is reduced to showing that if $a, b \notin A \cap B$ then $(a\ b) \cdot x = x$. Since A and B are finite, they are decidable subsets of $\mathbb{A}$. Hence we can split into the 16 cases depending on whether or not a and b are elements of A and B. By assumption $a, b \notin A \cap B$ so we can eliminate these 7 cases immediately. If $a, b \notin A$ then $(a\ b)$ fixes A which is a support for x so already $(a\ b) \cdot x = x$. Similarly for $a, b \notin B$. So we can eliminate another 7 cases. This only leaves the case $a \in A$ and $b \in B$ and the case $b \in A$ and $a \in B$. Without loss of generality, we only have to check the case $a \in A$ and $b \in B$. Since $\mathbb{A}$ is infinite there exists $c \notin A \cup B$. Then we decompose $(a\ b)$ as follows.

$$(a\ b) = (b\ c) \circ (a\ c) \circ (b\ c) \tag{2}$$

Then $(b\ c)$ fixes A and $(a\ c)$ fixes B. Hence each transposition in the composition fixes x and so $(a\ b)$ does also. □

Proposition 2.3. *In* **ZF** *the following holds. Suppose that X is a* Perm($\mathbb{A}$)*-set and $(A_i)_{i \in I}$ is an indexed family of finite supports for $x \in X$ with I inhabited. Then $\bigcap_{i \in I} A_i$ is also a finite support for x.*

Proof. Since I is inhabited, there exists some $i_0 \in I$. Note that we have

$$\bigcap_{i \in I} A_i = \bigcap_{i \in I} (A_{i_0} \cap A_i) \tag{3}$$

$$= \bigcap \{B \in \mathcal{P}(A_{i_0}) \mid (\exists i \in I)\, B = (A_i \cap A_{i_0})\} \tag{4}$$

In classical logic the class of finite sets is closed under power sets and subsets, so the set $\{B \in \mathcal{P}(A_{i_0}) \mid (\exists i \in I)\, B = A_i\}$ is a finite collection of finite sets. The result now follows from proposition 2.2. □

Proposition 2.4. *In* **ZF***, for any nominal set X, and any $x \in X$ there exists a least finite support of x, which is defined as below.*

$$\mathrm{Supp}(x) := \bigcap \{A \subseteq \mathbb{A} \mid A \textit{ is a finite support for } x\} \tag{5}$$

Proof. Since X is a nominal set, x must have at least one finite support. Now applying proposition 2.3 the definition given is a finite support of x. However, it is a subset of any finite support of x by definition. □

The concept of least finite support is used throughout standard presentations of nominal sets such as [4]. However, we will see that the theorems of **ZF** above fail quite badly in a constructive setting, so least finite support should not be used constructively.

Much of the basic theory of nominal sets has been proved constructively (and avoiding least finite support) by Choudhury in [3], with proofs verified electronically in the Agda proof assistant.

3 The Counterexamples

We aim towards a theorem providing our first example of a nominal set where least finite support does not provably exist. We use a concrete definition that only requires the natural number object $\mathbb{N}$, the terminal object, the nominal set of names $\mathbb{A}$, binary coproducts and a single instance of exponentiation.

Definition 3.1. Let X be a nominal set. We say a *support function* is a function $S \colon X \to \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{fin}}\mathbb{A}$, such that for every $x \in X$, $S(x)$ is a finite support of x.

Proposition 3.2. *Let X be a nominal set where for every $x \in X$, a least finite support of x exists. Then X admits a support function.*

Proof. Least finite support is unique if it exists, so it gives us a well defined function. □

Recall that exponentials in nominal sets are implemented as follows. We first define the exponential Y^X in $\mathrm{Perm}(\mathbb{A})$-sets to be the exponential in **Set** (i.e. the set of functions from X to Y) together with action given by conjugation (i.e. $\pi \cdot f(x) := \pi \cdot (f(\pi^{-1} \cdot x))$). We then take the nominal set exponential to be the subobject of Y^X consisting of those functions f for which a finite support exists. One can show that this is still an exponential constructively either directly, or by adapting the proof of [4, Theorem 2.19].

We also recall the following basic facts about nominal sets.

1. The natural number object in nominal sets is just $\mathbb{N}$ with the trivial action ($\pi \cdot n = n$ for all n).

2. The terminal object 1 in nominal sets is any singleton set with the trivial action.

3. The set of names, $\mathbb{A}$, can be viewed as a nominal set in a canonical way by taking $\pi \cdot a$ to be $\pi(a)$.

4. Coproducts are implemented as disjoint union, as in **Set**, with action defined componentwise.

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose that the following nominal set admits a support function.*

$$(\mathbb{A} + 1)^{\mathbb{N}} \tag{6}$$

Then **WLPO** *follows. (And hence one cannot show constructively that this nominal set admits a support function, or that every element has least finite support).*

Proof. Assume that S is a support function for $(\mathbb{A} + 1)^{\mathbb{N}}$.

We write $*$ for the unique element of 1.

Let $\underline{*}\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{A} + 1$ be the function constantly equal to $*$. Let $a \in \mathbb{A} \setminus S(\underline{*})$.

Now for any $\alpha\colon \mathbb{N} \to 2$, we consider $\alpha_a\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{A} + 1$ as below.

$$\alpha_a(n) := \begin{cases} * & \alpha(n) = 0 \\ a & \alpha(n) = 1 \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

First note that α_a is equivariant if and only if we have $(\forall n \in \mathbb{N})\, \alpha(n) = 0$. Certainly if $\alpha(n) = 0$ for every n then α_a is equivariant. For the converse, let $a' \in \mathbb{A} \setminus \{a\}$ and note that $(a\ a') \cdot \alpha_a = \alpha_a$, by equivariance. Then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $(a\ a') \cdot \alpha_a(n) = \alpha_a(n)$. Now for every n, we have $\alpha(n) = 0$ or $\alpha(n) = 1$, because $\mathbb{N}$ has decidable equality, but if $\alpha(n) = 1$, then we would get

$$\alpha_a(n) = a \tag{8}$$
$$\alpha_a(n) = (a\ a') \cdot \alpha_a(n) \tag{9}$$
$$= (a\ a') \cdot a \tag{10}$$
$$= a' \neq a \tag{11}$$

Hence we derive $\alpha(n) = 0$ for all n, as required.

Since $S(\alpha_a)$ is finite we have that either $a \in S(\alpha_a)$ or $a \notin S(\alpha_a)$. We split into the two cases. If $a \in S(\alpha_a)$, then $S(\alpha_a) \neq S(\underline{*})$. Since S is a function, this gives $\alpha_a \neq \underline{*}$. But then we must have $\neg(\forall n \in \mathbb{N})\, \alpha(n) = 0$. On the other hand, if $a \notin S(\alpha_a)$, then $\emptyset$ is a support for α_a (since it is the intersection of $S(\alpha_a)$ and $\{a\}$). Hence we have $(\forall n \in \mathbb{N})\, \alpha(n) = 0$. So applying this for any α, we get **WLPO**. □

In the next lemma we give another example which is less concrete, but in some ways more useful. A key point is that in the previous example there was an element that was equivariant if and only if the statement $(\forall n \in \mathbb{N})\, \alpha(n) = 0$ holds, whereas in the next lemma we will see that something similar can be done more generally for any bounded formula.

Lemma 3.4. *Let ϕ be a formula with only bounded quantifiers. (The reason for this restriction is that* **CZF** *has separation only for bounded formulas; over* **IZF** *ϕ can by any formula). There is a nominal set X and an element $\bar{a} \in X$ such that $\bar{a}$ is equivariant iff ϕ holds.*

Also there is a set $\mathcal{S}$ such that

1. *$\mathcal{S}$ is inhabited*
2. *Each $S \in \mathcal{S}$ is a finite support of $\bar{a}$*
3. *If $\bigcap \mathcal{S}$ is a support for $\bar{a}$, then $\neg\neg\phi \to \phi$.*

Furthermore, if ϕ is of the form $\psi \vee \neg\psi$ where $\neg\neg\psi \to \psi$, then there are subfinite supports S_1 and S_2 of $\bar{a}$ such that $S_1 \cap S_2 = \emptyset$. (Note also that $\neg\neg(\psi \vee \neg\psi)$ holds for any formula ψ in intuitionistic logic, so if $\bigcap \mathcal{S}$ is a support for $\bar{a}$, we derive in this case $\psi \vee \neg\psi$.)

Proof. Fix a bounded formula, ϕ. For any $a \in \mathbb{A}$, define

$$\bar{a} := \{x \in \{a\} \mid \phi\} \cup (\mathbb{A} \setminus \{a\}) \tag{12}$$

We then define X to be the set

$$X := \{\bar{a} \mid a \in \mathbb{A}\} \tag{13}$$

We define the action of $\pi \in \mathrm{Perm}(\mathbb{A})$ by

$$\pi \cdot \bar{a} := \{\pi(x) \mid x \in \bar{a}\} = \overline{\pi(a)} \tag{14}$$

Suppose that ϕ holds. Then $\bar{a} = \mathbb{A}$ and hence for all $\pi \in \mathrm{Perm}(\mathbb{A})$ we have $\pi \cdot \bar{a} = \bar{a}$. Therefore $\bar{a}$ is equivariant.

Conversely, suppose that $\bar{a}$ is equivariant. Then for any $a' \neq a$ we have $(a\ a') \cdot \bar{a} = \bar{a}$. Certainly $a' \in \bar{a}$, so we deduce $a \in \bar{a}$, and so ϕ must hold.

We have now shown that $\bar{a}$ is equivariant iff ϕ holds.

Now define $\mathcal{S}$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{S} := \{x \in \{\emptyset\} \mid \phi\} \cup \{\{a\}\} \tag{15}$$

$\mathcal{S}$ is inhabited since $\{a\} \in \mathcal{S}$.

For any $S \in \mathcal{S}$ we have that either $S = \emptyset$ and ϕ holds, or $S = \{a\}$. In both cases S is a finite support of $\bar{a}$.

Now assume that $\bigcap \mathcal{S}$ is a support for $\bar{a}$. Since $\phi \to \emptyset \in \mathcal{S}$ we have $\phi \to \bigcap \mathcal{S} = \emptyset$, and so $\neg\neg\phi \to \neg\neg \bigcap \mathcal{S} = \emptyset$. However, from $\neg\neg \bigcap \mathcal{S} = \emptyset$ we can derive $\bigcap \mathcal{S} = \emptyset$: in general the statement that a set X is empty is stable under double negation which is easy to show noting that X is empty precisely when $(\forall x \in X)\, \bot$. But then $\bigcap \mathcal{S}$ being a support for $\bar{a}$ says precisely that $\emptyset$ is a support for $\bar{a}$, which we have already shown implies ϕ. Putting this together gives us that if $\bigcap \mathcal{S}$ is a support for $\bar{a}$ then $\neg\neg\phi \to \phi$, as required.

Now suppose that ϕ is of the form $\psi \vee \neg\psi$ where $\neg\neg\psi \to \psi$ and define S_1 and S_2 as follows:

$$S_1 := \{a \in \{a\} \mid \psi\} \tag{16}$$

$$S_2 := \{a \in \{a\} \mid \neg\psi\} \tag{17}$$

Suppose that π is a finite permutation such that $\pi(x) = x$ whenever $x \in S_1$. Note that this precisely says that if ψ holds then $\pi(a) = a$. Since equality in $\mathbb{A}$ is decidable, we have $\pi(a) = a$ or $\pi(a) \neq a$. In the former case, we easily have that $\pi \cdot \bar{a} = \bar{a}$. In the latter case, we deduce $a \notin S_1$ and so $\neg\psi$ and thereby ϕ which is equal to $\psi \vee \neg\psi$. Since this implies $\bar{a}$ is equivariant, we also have in this case that $\pi \cdot \bar{a} = \bar{a}$. Hence S_1 is a support for $\bar{a}$. For S_2 we start the same as before. However, if π fixes the elements of S_2 and $\pi(a) \neq a$ we only derive $\neg\neg\psi$. At this point we use the assumption that $\neg\neg\psi \to \psi$ and then continue the same as before.

Finally, we easily have $S_1 \cap S_2 = \emptyset$ since $\psi \wedge \neg\psi$ is false. □

We now apply the above examples to get a number of independence results.

Theorem 3.5. *Suppose that any one of the statements below holds in general for all nominal sets X and Y and all elements x of X. Then* **WLPO** *follows. Hence none of these statements are constructively provable in general.*

1. *If X and Y admit support functions then so does Y^X.*
2. *If every element of X and every element of Y has a least finite support, then so does every element of Y^X.*
3. *The intersection of all finite supports of x is finite.*
4. *The intersection of all finite supports of x is a support of x.*
5. *x has a least finite support.*
6. *x has a least subfinite support.*
7. *The binary intersection of two subfinite supports of x is a support of x.*
8. *For every subfinite support S of x, there is a finite support S' of x such that $S' \subseteq S$.*

Proof. For 1 and 2, we apply theorem 3.3 directly, noting that every element of $\mathbb{A} + 1$ and every element of $\mathbb{N}$ has least finite support.

For 3, we take $X := (\mathbb{A} + 1)^{\mathbb{N}}$ and again apply theorem 3.3. Let α_a be as in the proof of theorem 3.3.

We first check that the intersection of all finite supports of α_a is equal to the following set.

$$L := \{x \in \{a\} \mid \neg\,(\forall n \in \mathbb{N})\,\alpha(n) = 0\} \tag{18}$$

To show the two sets are equal, we need to show that they have the same elements. Suppose first that $x \in L$. First note that we must have $x = a$ and that $\neg\,(\forall n \in \mathbb{N})\,\alpha(n) = 0$ is true. We want to show that a lies in every finite support of α_a. Let S be a finite support of α_a. We want to show $a \in S$, but since S is a finite, and so decidable subset of $\mathbb{A}$, it suffices to show $\neg\neg a \in S$. Now if we had $a \notin S$, then we would have $S \cap \{a\} = \emptyset$. But then $\emptyset$, as the intersection of two finite supports would itself be a finite support, making α_a equivariant and so we would get $(\forall n \in \mathbb{N})\,\alpha(n) = 0$, contradicting $\neg(\forall n \in \mathbb{N})\,\alpha(n) = 0$. We deduce $\neg\neg a \in S$ and so $a \in S$, as required.

Now conversely, assume that x belongs to every finite support of α_a. Since $\{a\}$ is a finite support we must have $x = a$. Furthermore, since the intersection of all finite supports is inhabited, $\emptyset$ cannot be a finite support. Hence α_a is not equivariant, and so we derive $\neg(\forall n \in \mathbb{N})\, \alpha_a(n) = 0$. But then we have $x \in L$.

We have now verified that L is equal to the intersection of all finite supports.

If L was finite, it would also be decidable as a subset of $\mathbb{A}$. But then we could decide whether or not $a \in L$ and then recalling that the statement $(\forall n \in \mathbb{N})\, \alpha(n) = 0$ is stable under double negation, derive $(\forall n \in \mathbb{N})\, \alpha(n) = 0 \vee \neg(\forall n \in \mathbb{N})\, \alpha(n) = 0$. If 3 held in general we could show this for any α and so derive **WLPO**.

For 4 to 8 we use lemma 3.4 as follows.

For 4, let ϕ be any bounded formula. Note that the intersection of all least finite supports of $\bar{a}$ has to be a subset of $\bigcap \mathcal{S}$ and so if it is a support then so is $\bigcap \mathcal{S}$. Hence if the intersection of all finite supports is a support for all elements of all nominal sets we derive $\neg\neg\phi \to \phi$ for any bounded formula ϕ (and therefore also $\phi \vee \neg\phi$ for any bounded ϕ). In particular this gives **WLPO**, but it is of course much stronger.

For 5, we can use either theorem 3.3 or lemma 3.4. There is also another example in [7, Section 6.1] based on the nerve of a metric space. Note that we again can in fact derive $\neg\neg\phi \to \phi$ for all bounded formulas when we use lemma 3.4.

For 6, note that any least subfinite support has to be in particular a subset of each finite support, and so also a subset of the intersection of all finite supports. But this would imply that the intersection of all finite supports is a support. Hence this part follows from part 4. It will also follow from 7, which we show next.

For 7, take ψ to be any bounded formula such that $\neg\neg\psi \to \psi$ and take ϕ to be $\psi \vee \neg\psi$, then apply the last part of lemma 3.4. If S_1 and S_2 are as in the statement of lemma 3.4 and $S_1 \cap S_2$ is a support of $\overline{a}$, then $\psi \vee \neg\psi$ holds. In particular, taking ψ to be $(\forall n \in \mathbb{N})\, \alpha(n) = 0$ for arbitrary binary sequences α gives us **WLPO**.

For 8, note that if there are finite supports S_1' and S_2' such that $S_1' \subseteq S_1$ and $S_2' \subseteq S_2$ then $S_1' \cap S_2'$ would also be a finite support. However, $S_1' \cap S_2' \subseteq S_1 \cap S_2$, so this would imply that $S_1 \cap S_2$ is a support and so we can again apply lemma 3.4. (Note also that L in the proof of part 3 is a subfinite support, and so that gives another proof.) □

Remark 3.6. *For 4, 5 and 6 of theorem 3.5, we could show not just* **WLPO**, *but $\phi \vee \neg\phi$ for all bounded formulas ϕ, which is much stronger. This schema is sometimes referred to as* restricted excluded middle, **REM**.

Remark 3.7. *Formally speaking, a subfinite subset A of $\mathbb{A}$ is just a subset of $\mathbb{A}$ which is subfinite. We know that $A \subseteq F$ for some finite set F. We don't necessarily have that F is itself a subset of $\mathbb{A}$. However, if we take "subfinite subset of $\mathbb{A}$" to mean a set satisfying the stronger condition, that it is a subset of a finite set that is itself a subset of $\mathbb{A}$, then lemma 3.4 and so also theorem 3.5 still hold.*

4 Acknowledgement

This is based on work carried out at the University of Leeds under EPSRC grant EP/K023128/1.

References

[1] P. Aczel and M. Rathjen. Notes on constructive set theory. Technical Report 40, Institut Mittag-Leffler, 2001.

[2] P. Aczel and M. Rathjen. Notes on constructive set theory. Book draft available at `http://www1.maths.leeds.ac.uk/~rathjen/book.pdf`, 2010.

[3] P. Choudhury. Constructive representation of nominal sets in agda. Master's thesis, Robinson College, University of Cambridge, June 2015. Available at `https://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/~amp12/agda/choudhury/choudhury-dissertation.pdf`.

[4] A. M. Pitts. *Nominal Sets: Names and Symmetry in Computer Science*, volume 57 of *Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.

[5] A. M. Pitts. Nominal presentation of cubical sets models of type theory. In H. Herbelin, P. Letouzey, and M. Sozeau, editors, *20th International Conference on Types for Proofs and Programs (TYPES 2014)*, Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs), Dagstuhl, Germany, 2015. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik.

[6] M. Rathjen. Realizability for constructive Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory. In V. Stoltenberg-Hansen and J. Väänänen, editors, *Logic Colloquium '03*. Association for Symbolic Logic, 2006.

[7] A. W. Swan. An algebraic weak factorisation system on 01-substitution sets: a constructive proof. arXiv:1409.1829, September 2014.